

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/003,639 .	11/02/2001	Bharat I. Chaudhary	44417A	1542
22515	7590 06/30/2004		EXAMINER	
THE DOW CHEMICAL COMPANY			CAIN, EDWARD J	
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY SECTION 2301 N BRAZOSPORT BLVD FREEPORT, TX 77541-3257			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1714	
			DATE MAILED 0//20/200	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/003,639	CHAUDHARY ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Edward J. Cain	1714				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet wi	h the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a rely within the statutory minimum of thirt will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON a. cause the application to become AB	ply be timely filed (30) days will be considered timely. "HS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final. 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. 						
Disposition of Claims						
4)	ected.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(oummary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date Iformal Patent Application (PTO-152) 				

Art Unit: 1714

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-4, 7, 8, 24-27, 30, 31 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by MacAdams et al.

MacAdams et al disclose rotationally molded articles produced from compositions comprising HDPE as the major resinous component along with 5-40 wt% ethylene vinyl acetate having a vinyl acetate content of 5-35 wt% (column 1, line 60 to column 2, line23). Each of Charts III and IV of the reference demonstrate improved impact strength values for the compositions over the pure HDPE. These values meet the limitation of the instant claims.

Claims 1-5, 7-8, 24-28, 30-31 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Needham.

Needham discloses compositions suitable for rotational molding comprising polyethylenes with density values of 0.92-0.97 and ethylene vinyl acetate with vinyl acetate contents of 5-50 wt% (column 2, line 47 and column 3, line 35). The relative amounts of EVA are taught as up to 4 wt%. Relative impact values between the pure

Art Unit: 1714

polyethylene and the compositions are taught in Table I and are seen as meeting applicants' claimed limitation.

The density values taught for the polyethylene are seen as encompassing those of the LLDPE claimed instantly.

Claims 1-4, 6-8, 24-27, 29-31 and 35-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Okayama et al.

Okayama et al disclose polypropylene compositions suitable for injection mold, blow molding and film formation (abstract, column 1, line 27-35 and column 4, lines 17-19). These compositions are taught as comprising a major portion of polypropylene and a minor portion of EVA. The EVA is taught as having a vinyl acetate content meeting applicants' limitation and as being present in relative proportions as claimed instantly (see claims 11, 19 and 20).

While the reference may not explicitly recite relative values of impact strength before and after addition of the EVA, it is the position of the examiner that values such as claimed instantly would be inherent to the compositions of the reference since all other limitations in the rejected claims are met.

Claims 1-5, 7-8, 24-28, 30-31 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kozma et al.

Kozma et al disclose polymeric compositions comprising LLDPE and EVA with vinyl acetate content of 9 to 60 wt % and in relative amounts such as claimed instantly (see claims). These compositions are taught as suitable for rotational molding (column 12, line 27).

Art Unit: 1714

While the reference may not explicitly recite relative values of impact strength before and after addition of the EVA, it is the position of the examiner that values such as claimed instantly would be inherent to the compositions of the reference since all other limitations in the rejected claims are met.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 13 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kozma et al in view of Swain.

Kozma et al disclose rotational molding compositions as discussed above. The reference is silent with respect to applicants' claimed particle size.

The reference to Swain is cited as teaching typical particle sizes for rotational molding as being from 22-50 mesh (column 1, line 47).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to produce particles of the Kozma et al compositions with particle sizes as taught by Swain when rotational molding was the intended use.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Edward J. Cain whose telephone number is (571) 272-1118. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 10:00 to 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan, can be reached on 571 272-1119. The fax phone

Art Unit: 1714

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Edward J. Cain Primary Examiner Art Unit 1714